

N. B. Britain & Ireland
Lords, House of THE
P R O C E E D I N G S
OF THE
House of PEERS

FROM

Tuesday, March the 14th, to Tuesday
the Twenty First.

Containing the

R E A S O N S

O F

Those LORDS that Enter'd their
PROTEST in

Dr. Sacheverell's C A S E.

To which is Added,

An *Exact LIST* of those Members of the
Honourable House of Commons that Voted
for him.

L O N D O N,

Printed, and Sold by J. BAKER at the *Black
Boy* in *Pater-noster Row*. 1710.

Price Four Pence.

N. B. Whatsoever other Copies are Publish'd of the Lords Prote-
station, will be found to want above half the Proceedings,
when compar'd with this True Copy.

Die Martis 14. Martii 1709.

A Debate arising, whether a Question should be stated.
It was propos'd to adjourn the House.
Then the Question was put, whether this House shall be now adjourn'd.
It was Resolved in the Negative.



Dissentient.

R. Ferrers,	Buckingham,	Chandos	Ashburnham,
Abingdon,	Poulet,	Osborne,	Ormonde,
Beaufort,	Dartmouth,	Leimpster,	Conway,
Denbeigh,	Guernsey,	Geo. Barb &	Stawell,
Fo. Ebor.	Wemyss,	Wells,	Mar,
Berkshire,	Scarborough,	Northampton,	Howard,
Weymouth,	Nottingham,	Berkeley Str.	Guilford,
Leigh,	Rochester,	Willoughby Br.	Plimouth,
Suffes,	North & Gre,	W. Cestrians,	Anglesey,
Lexington,	N. Duresme,	Suffolk,	H. London,
Hamilton,	Scarsdale,	Haversham,	Tbanet,
Fersey,	Weston,	Northesk,	Tho. Roffen.
Craven,	Lieds,		

Then after further Debate, the Question was put :
That by the Law and Usage of Parliaments in Prosecutions, by Impeachments for High Crimes and Misdemeanours, by writing or speaking, the particular Words, supposed to be Criminal, are not necessary to be expressly specified in such Impeachments.
It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient.

Buckingham,	Hamilton,	Dartmouth,	Tho. Roffen,
Fo. Ebor,	Berkeley Str.	Mar,	Geo. Barb &
H. London,	Northesk,	Haversham,	Wells.

I. Because we conceive the Law of the Land, is as much the Rule of Judicature, as it is in Inferiour Courts of Justice; and since by the Opinion of all the Judges, in all Prosecutions by Information or Indictment, for writing or speaking, the particular Words supposed to be Criminal, must be expressly specified in such Information or Indictment; and that this is the Law of the Land confirmed by constant Practice, we conceive, that there is the same Reason, and Justice, for specifying in Impeachments, the particular Words supposed to be Criminal; for otherwise a Person who is Innocent, and Safe by the Law out of Parliament, may nevertheless be condemned in Parliament.

For we conceive, That some Reasons of Law and Justice, why the Words supposed Criminal must be specified in Informations and Indictments may be, that the Party accused may certainly know his Charge, and be thereby enabled to defend his Innocence, that the Jury may know it too, and be enabled thereby the better to apply the Evidence given by the Witnesses, to the Matter of such Charge, and that the Judges themselves may the better judge of the Nature of the Crime, and of a Punishment *Aduquate* to it, which in Cases of Misdemeanours, which are Indefinite and Innumerable, must extremely vary, according to the heinousness of the Offence; and finally, That the House of Lords, upon Complaint to them, may also Judge, whether the Fine, which is usually one of the Punishments for Misdemeanours, do not exceed the Demerit, especially since by the Bill of Rights, exorbitant Fines are declared to be Illegal, which Reasons seem to be fully as strong in the Case of Impeachments, "As in Indictments and Informations; for the particular Words are as necessary to enable the Lords, to determine uprightly and impartially, as the Jury or Judges, and as necessary for the Defence of the accused here, as in the Courts below; and if there were to be a Difference, it seems more necessary in this High Court: For the weightier the Prosecution is, the more need has an unfortunate Man of Indulgence, and all lawful Favour; and surely there cannot be an heavier Load upon Man, than an Accusation by all the Commons of Britain.

" We

" We do not Remember any Precedent insisted on for the maintenance of this Resolution, save only the Case of Dr. Manwaring, which we conceive could not warrant this Resolution: For, First, the Words charged upon him by the Commons Declaration, were not compared with the Sermons tho' it was desired, and consequently, no Lord could say, they were not the Words of the Sermons and therefore upon such Uncertainty, we conceive we could not ground a Positive Resolution.

The Charge upon him taken out of his Sermon, on the 4th of May 1628. Seems to be the very Words by him spoken; for they were attested by Ear Witnesses, who surely never were, or could be admitted to attest their own Conjectures of the Scope of a Sermon; and not specify the very Words, for that would be to make the Witnesses to be the Judges.

Besides in such a Case as this; where the Party did not insist upon any Legal and just Exceptions, of which he might have taken Advantage; if he had made his Defence, which he did not, but Submitted, and begged Pardon, this ought not to be looked upon as a Precedent for Authority to Justifie the Illegality, of the Form of that Impeachment.

But altho', this Precedent were full and Express to the Point Resolved; We humbly Conceive that one Precedent is not Sufficient to Support a Law and Custom of Parliament, nor Consequently a Resolution declaring it; for surely there is great difference between a single Instance, and a Law and Custom.

Since we Conceive that in all the Precedents, at least that have appeared to us for Four hundred Years, of the Prosecutions in Parliament, the Particular Words charged as Criminal, have been Constantly expressed in the Article, or Declarations of Impeachment.

* *Exilium Hugonis de Spencer Patris & Filii;* the First Article was for making a Bill E. 28 in Writing, the Tenor whereof, was particularly Set forth.

William de la Pool 6. Art. was for Words Spoken by him, in the Council in the Star-Chamber, (Viz.) That He said, he had a Place in the Council House of the French King, as he had here, and was as well trusted as he was here, and could remove from the French King, the Priviest Man of his Council, if he would.

Lord Finch. The Opinions, he delivered are set forth in *hac Verba*, as also the times when he delivered them.

Another Opinion delivered by him in the Exchequer Chamber, and Western Circuit, is set down in his Express Words.

Dr. Cosens.

He is Charged with Words delivered in a Sermon at Durham, the Words were these, The Reformers, &c.

Charges him with Words in like manner, the Words were these, the King, &c.

Berkley.

The Words charged upon him, are Expressly mentioned.

That he Subscribed an Opinion in *hac Verba*, which are specified.

The matter therein charged, tho' of Record was Copied and delivered with the Articles.

The Words spoken and the Place Expressly set forth.

Judge Crawley.

For Subscribing and giving Opinions set forth in *hac Verba*.

Herbert.

For Exhibiting of Articles against the Five Members, which Articles follow in these Words, &c.

Thirteen Bishops Impeached for making and Promulging in 1640. Several Constitutions and Canons, contrary to the Kings Prerogative, &c.

They demurred because the Charge was General, but Receded from this Demurr, because it appeared to be particular.

Earl Strafford.

Expresses the Words spoken by him, and the time.

20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27. Expresses the very Words spoke by him, 26. is in like manner, with an Inuendo of his meaning.

Arch. Bishop Laud.

10. Expresses the Words spoken by Him.

12. Expresses the Words Spoken by Him, and the Time and Place.

So Necessary did the long Parliament it self, think it, to pursue the Forms of Law in all their Prosecutions.

Upon the whole therefore, we humbly conceive that so great a Number of Precedents, is sufficient to outweigh the single Instance of Dr. Manwaring's Case, how opposite soever it may seem to be to the present Case, which for the Reasons we have mentioned, is far from being Plain and Clear, or having the full Authority of a Precedent, and the Law and Custom of Parliaments, as we conceive is to be de-
Odious

* Vid. This Case at large in Sir Simon Harcourt's Speech, in the Tryal, pag. 126.

terminated by constant Course and Practice, and not one Precedent occasioned by so Odious Doctrines, as those of Dr. *Manwaring*; nor can the contrary Assertion to the abovesaid Resolution, be of any ill Consequence to Impeachments by the Commons because 'tis easie for them to Specifie the Words, which offend them; but extremely Difficult for the accused to defend himself, without knowing them; and as all who are charged Criminally, have leave to make their Defence, so they should also have allowed to them all Lawful means for it.

<i>Jo. Ebor,</i>	<i>Yarmouth,</i>	<i>Leimpster,</i>	<i>North & Grey,</i>
<i>N. Duresme,</i>	<i>Rochester,</i>	<i>H. London,</i>	<i>Willoughby Br.</i>
<i>Sussex,</i>	<i>Weymouth,</i>	<i>Leeds,</i>	<i>Craven,</i>
<i>Scarsdale,</i>	<i>Scarborough,</i>	<i>Thanet,</i>	<i>Osborne,</i>
<i>Plymouth,</i>	<i>W. Cestriens,</i>	<i>Anglesey,</i>	<i>Howard,</i>
<i>R. Ferrers,</i>	<i>Starwell,</i>	<i>Abingdon,</i>	<i>Guernsey,</i>
<i>Beaufort,</i>	<i>Conway,</i>	<i>Northampton,</i>	<i>Nottingham,</i>
<i>Denbigh,</i>	<i>Guildford,</i>	<i>Jersey,</i>	<i>Berkshire.</i>

Die Jovis 16. Martii 1709.

IT being moved to declare, That the Commons had made good the first Article against Dr. *Sacheverell*.

After long Debate thereupon: This Question was proposed.

That the Commons have made good their first Article of Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity.

And after further Debate thereupon:

The Question was put, whether this Question shall be now put.

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient,

Because we humbly conceive, there are no Reflections therein contained on the Memory of the late King *William* nor the Revolution, and that there is no Offence charged therein upon Dr. *Sacheverell*, against any known Law of the Land.

<i>Hamilton,</i>	<i>Rochester,</i>	<i>Lexington,</i>	<i>Anglesey,</i>
<i>Suffolk,</i>	<i>Scarborough,</i>	<i>Leigh,</i>	<i>Nottingham,</i>
<i>Poulet,</i>	<i>Guildford,</i>	<i>Osborne,</i>	<i>North & Grey,</i>
<i>Mar,</i>	<i>Yarmouth,</i>	<i>N. Duresme,</i>	<i>Scarsdale,</i>
<i>Waston,</i>	<i>R. Ferrers,</i>	<i>Jo. Ebor,</i>	<i>Berkeley Str.</i>
<i>W. Cestriens,</i>	<i>Geo. Bath &</i>	<i>Ormonde,</i>	<i>Guernsey,</i>
<i>Plymouth,</i>	<i>Wells,</i>	<i>Shrewsbury,</i>	<i>Thanet,</i>
<i>Wemyss,</i>	<i>Starwell,</i>	<i>Buckingham,</i>	<i>Jersey,</i>
<i>Leimpster,</i>	<i>Abingdon,</i>	<i>Northesk,</i>	<i>Conway,</i>
<i>Tbo. Roffen,</i>	<i>Northampton,</i>	<i>Say & Seale,</i>	<i>H. London,</i>
<i>Denbigh,</i>	<i>Craven,</i>	<i>Chandos,</i>	<i>Dartmouth,</i>
<i>Sussex,</i>	<i>Weymouth,</i>	<i>Beaufort,</i>	<i>Haverham.</i>
<i>Berkshire,</i>			

Then the main Question was put:

That the Commons have made good their first Article of Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity.

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient,

Because by the Laws of the Land, the Laws of Parliament, and the inherent Right of *Peerage*, every Peer is to judge for himself, both of the Fact, as well as of the Law, and cannot be precluded from it, by any Majority, which indeed must determine the Case in respect of the Criminal, but never did, nor can preclude any Lord from Voring the Party accused, *Guilty* or *Not Guilty* of the Fact, as well as of the Crime of such Fact.

Dartmouth,
Guildford,
N. Duresme.

<i>Sussex,</i>	<i>Geo. Bath &</i>	<i>Thanet,</i>	<i>Beaufort,</i>
<i>Yarmouth,</i>	<i>Wells,</i>	<i>Northampton,</i>	<i>Denbigh,</i>
<i>Jersey,</i>	<i>Berkshire,</i>	<i>Nottingham,</i>	<i>Scarsdale,</i>
<i>W. Cestriens,</i>	<i>Rochester,</i>	<i>Scarborough,</i>	<i>R. Ferrers,</i>
<i>Conway,</i>	<i>Plymouth,</i>	<i>Weymouth,</i>	<i>North & Grey,</i>
<i>H. London,</i>	<i>Howard,</i>	<i>Starwell,</i>	<i>Osborne,</i>
<i>Tbo. Roffen,</i>	<i>Leigh,</i>	<i>Guernsey,</i>	<i>Abingdon.</i>

Die

Die Veneris 17. Martij 1709.

THE House pursuant to the Order Yesterday, took into Consideration the Second Article of the Commons Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity.

And after Debate thereupon,

That the Commons have made good the Second Article of their Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity,

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient,

Then the third Article being Read out of the Commons Impeachment,

The Question was put,

That the Commons have made good the the third Article of their Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity.

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient,

The fourth Article being Read out of the Commons Impeachment,

This Question was put,

That the Commons have made good the fourth Article of their Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity.

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Dissentient,

To the Questions upon the Second, Third, and Fourth Articles, we dissent for the same Reason as is given against the Question upon the First.

Buckingham
Hamilton,
Lexington,
Dartmouth,
J. Ebor,
W. Cestriens,
Tho. Roffen,
N. Duresme,
George Bath &
Wells,

Beaufort,
Denbigh,
Nottingham,
Rocheſter,
Weymouth,
Howard,
H. London,
Haverſham,
Ormonde,
Willoughby Br.

Berkſhire,
Scarſdale,
Stawell,
Poulet,
Abingdon,
Conway,
Osborne,
Weston,
Craven,
Suffex,

Yarmouth,
Ferſey,
Thanet,
Plymouth,
Northampton,
Angleſey,
Guilford,
Leigh,
Guernſey.

Die Sabbati 18. Martij. 1709.

THEN the Question propos'd Yesterday, to be asked every Lord in *Westminster-Hall*, was read (*Viz.*)

That the Commons having made good the Several Articles of the Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity; the said Doctor *Henry Sacheverell* is Guilty, of High Crimes and Misdemeanours. The Order being also Read for refusing the Adjourn'd Debate thereupon,

It was moved and (after Debate) agreed to leave out the First part of the propos'd Question (*Viz.*)

That the Commons having made good the Several Articles of the Impeachment against *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity,

It is ordered by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled, that the Question to be put to each Lord in the Hall, beginning at the Junior Baron first, Shall be,

Is Doctor *Henry Sacheverell* Guilty of the High Crimes and Misdemeanours Charged upon him by the Impeachment ?

Then it being propos'd to Consider what Answer each Lord shall Give and Debate thereupon,

This Question was propos'd, whether the Answer to be given by each Lord shall be Guilty or not Guilty (only,)

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Then the main Question was put, Whether it shall be ask'd,

Is *Henry Sacheverell*, Dr. in Divinity, Guilty of High Crimes and Misdemeanours whereof He stands Impeach'd ?

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

It is order'd by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled, that the Question to be put to each Lord in *Westminster-Hall*, shall be,

Is Henry Sacheverell, Doctor in Divinity, Guilty of High Crimes and Misdemeanours, Charg'd on him by the Impeachment of the House of Commons? And the Answer therunto shall be, *Guilty* or not *Guilty*, (only.)

Dissentient,

First, We do humbly Conceive that the obliging every Lord to answer generally, *Guilty* or not *Guilty*, to a Question containing all the Articles of this Impeachment; is a kind of Tacking upon our selves, by an unnecessary Joining Matters of a Different Nature, and Subjecting them to one and the same Determination, and Consequently may Prejudice the Right every Peer has, to give a free Affirmative, or Negative; Since, whoever thinks Doctor *Sacheverell* Guilty of one Part, and Innocent of the other, will be obliged either to Approve what He Condemns, or Condemn what He Approves.

Secondly, We humbly conceive, there is at least a Possibility, that tho' a Majority of the House, if admitted to Vote to the Articles Separately, may think him Innocent upon each Article, yet by this Method of a general Answer, he may be Condemned of all; which seems not to be Consistent with the usual Method of Justice in this House.

Thirdly, We do humbly conceive, That since the Judgment of the House in this Case, ought to be a Declaration of the Law, the Condition of the People will be most Miserable, to have Punishment for High Crimes and Misdemeanours, and not have a Possibility of informing themselves what the Crimes thereby Punish'd, are; for the Peoples only Guide is the Law, and they can never be Guided by what they can never be Inform'd of: And we do humbly conceive, That this Uncertainty being in the Case of a Clergy-Man for Preaching, It may Possibly Create some Fear in Good Men when they Preach some Doctrines of the Church of England, Particularly that of *Non-Resistance*; and may be made use of by ill ones, as an Excuse for the Neglect of that Duty, which upon some Occasions, is required of them, even by the Laws of the Land.

Buckingham,
Hamilton,
Mar,
Lexington,
Dartmouth,
Norfolk,
Jo. Ebor,
W. Cestriens,
Tho. Roffen,
N. Duresme,
Shrewsbury,
Willoughby Br.

Haverham,
Ormonde,
Beaufort,
Denbigh,
Northampton,
Rochester,
Weymouth,
Craven,
Osborne,
Guilford,
Leimpster,
Leeds,

Berkshire,
Scarfsdale,
Yarmouth,
Scawell,
R. Ferrers,
Poulet,
Howard,
Plymouth,
Conway,
Geo. Bath and
Wells,

Anglesey,
Thanet,
Nottingham,
H. London,
Suffex,
North & Gray,
Abingdon,
Jersey,
Leigh,
Weston,
Guernsey,

Die Luna 20. Martij 1709.

THE House (pursuant to the Order of *Saturday* last) adjourn'd into *Westminster-Hall*, and being there,

The House was resum'd, and the Lord Chancellor declar'd, That the Lords had agreed upon a Question, to be put to each Lord severally.

Then his Lordship put the Question, beginning at the *Junior* Baron First, as follows.

Is Dr. Henry Sacheverell Guilty of High Crimes and Misdemeanours Charg'd upon him by the Impeachment of the House of Commons?

And having ask'd every Lord present, and they having declared, *Guilty*, or not *Guilty*,

His Lordship having Cast up the Votes, Declared him *Guilty*.

Dissentient,
Suffex,
Yarmouth,
Jo. Ebor,
Mar,
Weymouth,
Willoughby,
Leigh,
Rochester,
Craven,
Northesk,
Conway,
Leeds,

Buckingham,
Thanet,
Nottingham,
North & Grey,
Abingdon,
Jersey,
H. London,
Guernsey,
Geo. Bath &
Wells,
Howard,
Tho. Roffen,

N. Duresme,
W. Cestriens,
Lexington,
Guilford,
Poulet,
Dartmouth,
Denbigh,
Ormonde,
Berkshire,
Plymouth,
Anglesey,
Scarfsdale,

Hamilton,
Beaufort,
Leimpster,
Northampton,
Weston,
Say and Seale,
Osborne,
Berkley, Str.
Scawell,
Shrewsbury,
Scarborough,
Chandos,

Die

Die Martis 21. Martii 1709.

THEN the House (pursuant to the Order yesterday) took into Consideration, what Censure to give upon *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor of Divinity.

And it being proposed as follows,

First, That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell* be enjoyn'd not to Preach during the Term of Seven Years.

Secondly, That for the same Term of Years, to be made incapable of receiving any other Ecclesiastical Benefice, than what he now enjoys.

Thirdly, That he be imprisoned in the *Tower*, for three Months, and until he find Sureties for his good Behaviour during the Term of Seven Years, before the Two Chief Justices.

Fourthly, That his Sermons be Burnt by the Hangman, at the *Exchange*, in the Presence of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs.

Then the House took the proposed Question into Consideration, Paragraph by Paragraph; and after Debate upon the first Paragraph,

It was agreed to leave out the Word (Seven) and it being propos'd instead thereof to insert the Word (Three.)

The Question was put,

Whether the Blank in the first Paragraph shall be fill'd up with the Word (Three.)

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Then the Question was put,

That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell* shall be enjoyn'd not to Preach during the Term of Three Years.

It was Resolved in the Affirmative.

Then the second Paragraph propos'd, was,

That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell* be made incapable of Receiving any Ecclesiastical Benefice for the space of Three Years.

And after Debate thereupon: This Question was put:

That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell* be made incapable of Receiving any further Ecclesiastical Benefice during the said Term of Three Years.

It was Resolved in the Negative.

Then the third Paragraph propos'd, was,

That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell* shall be imprisoned in the *Tower* for three Months, and until he find Sureties for his good Behaviour.

This was not insisted on.

Then the fourth Paragraph proposed was,

That Dr. *Sacheverell's* Two Sermons be Burnt by the Hangman at the *Exchange*, in the Presence of the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs.

And after further Debate, this Question was put,

That the Two Printed Sermons of Dr. *Henry Sacheverell*, referred to by the Impeachment of the House of Commons, shall be Burnt before the *Royal-Exchange* by the Hands of the Common Hangman, in the Presence of the Lord-Mayor of London, and the Two Sheriffs of London and Middlesex.

It was Resolv'd in the Affirmative.

It is Order'd by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament Assembled, that the Judgment to be pass'd in the Case of Dr. *Henry Sacheverell*, shall be:

That *Henry Sacheverell*, Doctor in Divinity, shall be, and is hereby enjoyned not to Preach during the Term of Three Years next ensuing.

That Dr. *Henry Sacheverell's* Two Printed Sermons referred to by the Impeachment of the House of Commons, shall be Burnt before the *Royal-Exchange* in London, between the Hours of Twelve and One, on Monday the 27th Day of this instant March, by the Hands of the Common Hangman, in the Presence of the Lord Mayor of the City of London, and the two Sheriffs of London and Middlesex.

Dissentient,

Jo. Ebor.

Abingdon,

Beaufort,

H. London,

North & Grey,

N. Duresme,

Geo. Bath &

Wells.

Backingham,

Scarsdale,

Thanet,

Rochester,

Poulet,

Anglesey,

Tho. Roffen,

R. Ferrers,

Guildford,

Ashburnham,

Leimpster,

Denbigh,

Berkshire,

Craven,

Howard,

Scarborough,

Northampton,

Conway,

Osborne,

Plymouth,

Suffex,

Weymouth,

Nottingham,

Guernsey,

Leigh.

Lately Published,

MEMOIRS relating to the Impeachment of *Thomas Earl of Danby*, (now Duke of Leeds,) in the Year 1678. wherein some Affairs of those Times are represented in a juster Light than has hitherto appeared. With an Appendix, containing the Proceedings in Parliament, Original Papers, Speeches of the Earl of *Shaftsbury*, Mr. *Pemsel*, &c. His Lordships Speech upon his Impeachment in the House of Peers, and his Arguments in the Courts of King's-Bench, upon a Motion for Bail. Printed for J. Morphew near Stationers-Hall. Price 4 s. Bound in Calf. N. B. The Case of this Noble Lord is very proper to be consulted, for a right understanding of the late Proceedings against Dr. *Sacheverell*, their Cases being Parallel in many Instances. J

An Alphabetical LIST of those Members of the Honourable House of Commons, that Voted for Dr. Sacheverell.

A Nnesley, Francis	Fleetwood, Henry	Pendarves, Alexander
Annesly, <i>Hon.</i> Arthur	Ferrier, Richard	Praed, John
Arundell, Francis	Forster, Thomas, <i>Jun.</i>	Pole, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Bar.</i>
Ackland, Richard	Fox, Charles	Pitt, George
Alcock, Lawrence	Foley, Edward	Prise, John of Westleton
Archer, Andrew	Griffith, William	Probey, John
Aislaby, John	Grahme, James	Parker, Christopher
Blagrave, Anthony	Garrard, <i>Sir</i> Samuel <i>Bar.</i>	Palmer, Jeffery
Bromley, John	Gape, John	Powys, <i>Sir</i> Tho. <i>ber Majesty's</i>
Bunbury, <i>Sir</i> Hen. <i>Bar.</i>	Gwyn, Francis	<i>Serjeant at Law.</i>
Buller, James	Girdler, Joseph, <i>Serj. at Law.</i>	Portman, Henry
Bankes, <i>Sir</i> Jacob, <i>Kt.</i>	Greville, <i>Honourable</i> Francis	Prowse, John, <i>deceased</i>
Borlace, John	Greville, <i>Hon.</i> Dodington	Philips, Edward
Bankes, John	Grandville, George	Paget, <i>the Rt. Hon.</i> Henry
Barthurst, Allen	Gorges, Henry	Parsons, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Kt.</i>
Bromley, William	Halley, Thomas	Popham, Francis
Baldwyn, Acton	Hyde, <i>Rt. Hon.</i> Henry <i>Lord</i>	Packington, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Bart.</i>
Beaumont, <i>Sir</i> Geo. <i>Bar.</i>	Herne Thomas	Price, Lewis
Bilson, Leonard	Hooper, Nicolas, <i>one of her</i>	Renda, Thomas
Barker <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Bar.</i>	<i>Majesty's Serjeants at Law.</i>	Rolle, Robert
Bruce, <i>Lord, Right Hon.</i> Cha.	Herne, Nathaniel	Rowney, Thomas
Bruce, <i>Hon.</i> Rob.	Herne, Frederick	Randyl, Morgan
Bruce, <i>Hon.</i> James	Harley, Edward	Stonehouse, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Bar.</i>
Benson, Rob.	Heysham, William	Scobell, Francis
Byerley, Rob.	Heysham, William	Seymour, <i>Sir</i> Edward, <i>Bart.</i>
Bland, <i>Sir</i> John <i>Bar.</i>	Harvey, Edward	Strangeways, Thomas
Boteler, John	Halford, Richard	Strangeways, Thomas, <i>Jun.</i>
Bulkeley, <i>Right Honourable</i>	Holmes, Henry	Seudamour, <i>Right. Honourable</i>
Richard <i>Lord Viscount.</i>	Hanmer, <i>Sir</i> Thomas, <i>Bar.</i>	<i>James Lord Viscount.</i>
Bertie, <i>Honourable</i> Henry	Hide, Robert	Shuttleworth, Richard
Bertie, Charles	Harvey, William	Stewart, Simeon
Bertie, <i>the Honourable</i> Henry	Hungerford, John	Stephens, William
Cotton, John Hynde	Harcourt, <i>Sir</i> Simon	Swift, Samuel
Conyers, John	Harley, Thomas	Sharpe, John
Curzon, John	Harley, <i>the Rt. Hon.</i> Robert	Stapylton, <i>Sir</i> Bryan, <i>Bart.</i>
Courtenay, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Bar.</i>	How, <i>Sir</i> Richard, <i>Bar.</i>	Seymour, <i>Sir</i> Henry, <i>Bart.</i>
Courtenay, George	Isham, <i>Sir</i> Justinian, <i>Bar.</i>	Shepherd, Samuel <i>Jun.</i>
Conyers, Thomas	Jenkinson, <i>Sir</i> Robert, <i>Bar.</i>	Shakerley, Peter
Child, <i>Sir</i> Richard, <i>Bar.</i>	Johnson, James	Trevnion, John
Cox, Charles	Johnson, <i>Sir</i> Henry, <i>Kt.</i>	Trelawny, Henry
Cecil, <i>the Honourable</i> Charles	Johnson, William	Trotman, Samuel
Colston, Edward, <i>Jun.</i>	Jeffreys ----- <i>(Edw.)</i>	Trevelyan, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Bart.</i>
Campion, Henry	Lewen, William	Vaughan, Richard
Cotes, John	Lifter, Thomas	Vaughan, Edward
Currance, Clement	Levinz, William	Windfor, <i>the Hon.</i> Dixey
Conway, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Bar.</i>	Lambert, Edmund	Wood, Nicolas
Cary, William	Long, <i>Sir</i> James, <i>Bar.</i>	Webb, Thomas
Chaffin, Thomas	Langharne, John	Walpole, Horatio
Cartwright, Thomas	Lawson, Gilfrid	Ward, John, of Capesthorn
Carr, Thomas	Manley, John	Winstanley, James
Dering, <i>Sir</i> Chomley, <i>Bar.</i>	Morice, <i>Sir</i> Nicolas, <i>Bar.</i>	Wynne, Richard
Drake, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Kt. Bar.</i>	Manaton, Henry	Withers, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Kt.</i>
Dolben, <i>Sir</i> Gilbert	Mervin, Richard	Windfor, <i>Rt. Hon.</i> Thomas
Davers, <i>Sir</i> Robert, <i>Bart.</i>	Meres, <i>Sir</i> Thomas, <i>Kt.</i>	<i>Lord Viscount.</i>
Duncombe, Edward	Moor, Arthur	Wentworth, <i>Hon.</i> Thomas
Duncombe <i>Sir</i> Charles, <i>Kt.</i>	Medlicot, Thomas	Whitlock, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Kt.</i>
Down, <i>Rt. Hon. Ld. Visc.</i>	Milburn, Clayton	Walter, <i>Sir</i> John, <i>Bar.</i>
Duncomb, Francis	Mordaunt, <i>Sir</i> John	Warre, <i>Sir</i> Francis, <i>Bar.</i>
Docminique, Paul	Middleton, <i>Sir</i> Richard, <i>Bar.</i>	Wrottesly, John
Etheridge, <i>Sir</i> James, <i>Kt.</i>	Manfell, <i>Sir</i> Thomas of	Weld, Joseph, <i>Serj. at Law</i>
Eliot, Edward	Margam, <i>Bar.</i>	Winnington, Edward
Eden, <i>Sir</i> Robert, <i>Bar.</i>	Nicholas, Edward	Wharton, <i>Sir</i> Michael, <i>Kt.</i>
Estricke, William	North, <i>the Hon.</i> Charles	Williams, <i>Sir</i> Edward, <i>Bart.</i>
Eversfeild, Charles	Newland, <i>Sir</i> George, <i>Kt.</i>	Williams, <i>Sir</i> William, <i>Bart.</i>
Fownes, Richard	Oglethorp, Theophilus	Willoughby of Eresby, <i>Rt.</i>
Foley, Thomas	Pitt, Robert	<i>Hon. Peregrine, Ld.</i>
Freeman, Ralph, <i>Jun.</i>		

12 DE 62

